

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5, 6, 7, 11-14, 15, 17, and 19 have been amended to clarify that the computation of both a first motion vector for a first macroblock and a second motion vector for a second macroblock use the same predetermined pattern of pixels. These amendments are supported by at least paragraphs [0037], Table 1, and Table 2 of the specification.

No new matter has been added.

CLAIMSClaim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, and 10-14 under "35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by EP 0973 336 A2 to Ando et al." Specifically with regards to Claims 1, 5, 7 and 11-14, the Examiner stated that:

In section 120 Ando states that the search area of a block of a reference, or previous image, is set. Establishing the search area of the reference block is equivalent to selecting a predetermined pattern of pixels in the previous image, as claimed, because the search area will have a unique pixel pattern based on the size of the area of the reference block.

Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claims 1, 7, and 15 more clearly distinguishes the difference between the Claims and Ando et al. Specifically, amended Claim 1 recites "selecting a predetermined pattern of pixels in the previous image" and "computing a first-macroblock difference measure for each of a first plurality of pixel blocks in the previous image to form a plurality of first-macroblock difference measures using the predetermined pattern of pixels" and "computing a second-macroblock difference measure for each of a second plurality of pixel blocks in the previous image to form a plurality of second-macroblock difference measures for the second macroblock using the predetermined pattern of pixels" (emphasis added). Thus, in Claim 1 the predetermined pattern of pixels is used for computing a first motion vector for a first macroblock and a second motion vector for a second macroblock. However, in Ando et al. each reference block has its own search area. Specifically, Ando et al. teaches that "the search area of a

block of a reference frame is initially set (at step S21)."
(Ando et al., Col 23, section 0121). Furthermore, Ando et al. teaches that "a search area SA is defined on the periphery of a block RBLCK of the reference frame 402 corresponding to the block CBLK as an origin." (Col. 5, section 0029, lines 6-8) (see also Fig. 2 of Ando et al.). In addition, Ando reinforces the concept of using multiple search areas in describing that when "a moving vector is searched, search areas overlap." (Ando et al., Col. 20, section 0108, lines 46-47). Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the search areas of Ando et al. do not teach or suggest the predetermined pattern of pixels as recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdraw of the rejection of Claim 1.

Applicant further submits that the checkerwise thinning process described by Ando et al. is not equivalent to the "predetermined pattern of pixels in the previous image" as recited in Claim 1. Specifically, Ando et al. teaches that "the block matching process is performed by checkerwise thinning out pixels of a block of a reference frame and pixels of a relevant block of the current frame." (emphasis added) (Ando et al., Col 25, section 0133, lines 39-42). Thus, Ando teaches to use checkerwise thinning on each block. However, as explained above, in Claim 1 the predetermined pattern of pixels is used in computing a difference measure for each of a plurality of pixel blocks for a first macroblock and a second macroblock. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit Claim 1 is patentable over Ando et al. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-6, which depend from Claim 1, are likewise patentable.

Like Claim 1, Claim 7 recites "selecting a predetermined pattern of pixels in the previous image", "computing a first accurate first-macroblock difference measure for the first closest first-macroblock matching pixel block using the

predetermined pattern of pixels", and "computing a first accurate second-macroblock difference measure for the first closest second-macroblock matching pixel block using the predetermined pattern of pixels" (emphasis added). As explained above with respect to Claim 1, neither the search areas or checkerboard thinning process taught by Ando et al. teach or suggest the predetermined pattern of pixels. Therefore, Applicant respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 7. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 8-14, which depend from Claim 7 are also patentable.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected Claim 4, 6, 9 and 15-19 as being unpatentable over EP 0 973 336 A2 to Ando et al. Applicants respectfully submit that due to the remarks presented above with regards to Claims 1 and 7, the rejection of Claims 4, 6 and 9 have been rendered moot because Claims 4 and 6 depend from Claim 1 and Claim 9 depends from Claim 7.

With respect to Claims 15-19, the Examiner stated that "the processors, comparator, buffer, and cache as claimed in claims 15-19, for the purpose of performing differencing, storing, and comparison, of pixel data, are well known functions, and components of motion vector calculation schemes and apparatuses." However, Claim 15 recites "a first first-phase processing unit coupled to the frame buffer and configured to compute a first plurality of first-macroblock difference measures and a first plurality of second-macroblock difference measures using a predetermined pattern of pixels". As explained above with respect to Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submits that Ando does not teach or suggest using a predetermined

pattern of pixels for both a first macroblock and a second macroblock as used in the Claims. Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 15. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 16-19, which depend from Claim 15.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-19 are pending in the present application. Reconsideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested. If there are any questions, please telephone Edward Mao at (925) 895-3546 to expedite prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Mao

Customer No.: 022888

Edward S. Mao
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 40,713

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION (37 C.F.R. 1.8(a))

I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and Trademark Office.

Date: 1-5-2004 Signature: *Edward Mao*